SOME NEW BOOKS.

Elections in Colonial Times.

The assertion made in the Declaration of Independence regarding the innate freedom and equality of all men was stripped of practical significance by the existence of a considerable slave element in the population. Another assertion, that representation must go hand in hand with taxation, was also unsupported by facts. Not only was a great majority of the inhabitants of England unrepresented at the time in the House of Commons, but in most, if not all, of the American colonies property restrictions on the franchise prevailed. In some of them the principle of universal suffrage was not accepted until the present century was well advanced, and in Rhode Island limitations of the franchise were enforced down to our own times. The truth is that our Southern colonies were democracies of the Greek type, resting on a substratum of slavery, while even in our Northern colonies the body of freemen represented in the tax-levying Legislature had underneath them another body of unrepresented citizens. This is a matter too often overlooked in school and college histories, and Dr. CORTLANDT F. BISHOP has rendered us a service by collecting the data relating to the subject in a book called *History of Elections in the American Colonies*, published by Columbia College. In its various chapters the history and management of both general and local elections are considered, but, for the purpose of this notice, we confine ourselves to that part of the work which deals with the qualifications required of electors, and shows just how far the several colonies carried out the idea that representation and taxation should be inseparable.

I.

The conditions of the franchise in colonial times were political, moral, religious, sexual, and they were also concerned with age, residence, and property. Let us look first at the property qualifications for voting for a member of the popular branch of a colonial legislature, for these were all-pervasive, whereas the religious and moral qualifications were practically limited to the colonies most directly under Puritan influence. When Massachusetts and Plymouth lost their independent status by their union under the charter of 1691, property replaced religion as the principal test of a man's right to vote. But, as Dr. Bishop shows in detail, in every province, whether royal or proprietary, there was introduced from the latter part of the seventeenth century some sort of property qualification, and the tendency during the middle of the eighteenth century was toward a certain amount of uniformity in this respect throughout the colonies. Our author thinks that, with the exception of Connecticut, the introduction of property qualifications in New England and Virginia was due solely to the interference of the Crown. This certainly was not the case in Connecticut, and the willingness with which, in the other New England colonies and Virginia, property restrictions were accepted seems to prove that public opinion was moving in that direction. Had this not been the case, every one of the colonies would have abolished property restrictions after the Declaration of Independence. It is true enough that, in the seventeenth century, the people of Virginia did not look with unmixed satisfaction upon a limitation of the suffrage, as is demonstrated by the action of the Assembly called during Bacon's revolt in 1676, when all freemen were admitted to share in the choice of Burgesses. When the rebellion, however, was put down this act was repealed, and, as far as Virginia was concerned, nonfreeholders were permanently deprived of the privilege of voting. In 1736 it became necessary for the Virginia House of Burgesses to define a freehold on account of the practice of conveying "inconsiderable parcels of land upon feigned considerations." Accordingly, the amount of land to be possessed by an elector was fixed at one hundred acres, if uninhabited, or twenty-five acres with a house and a plantation. Some years afterward it was enacted that fifty unsettled acres would qualify a freeholder. It was provided that on the settled plantation of twenty-five acres there must be a house twelve feet square, and, if the estate was in several counties, the elector could vote only in that county in which the house was situated. At first the estate must be a freehold, but subsequently, in Virginia, it was enacted that an estate for a man's own life or for the life of his wife was qualified. Eventually an estate for the life of another (*per autre vie*) was held sufficient. With reference to joint estates, there was a peculiar provision in Virginia. At first joint tenants, or tenants in common, had but one vote between them unless the quantity of land was sufficient to give each of them the number of acres required to qualify a single voter. Subsequently it was enacted that where there was only property enough to qualify for a single vote the vote was not to be given unless the owners should agree. As to length of possession, the Virginia law declared that no person could vote in respect of any lands or tenements whereof he had not been in possession for a whole year next before the issue of the writ of election unless such lands or tenements had come to such person within that time by descent, marriage, marriage settlement, or devise. Just before the Revolution the length of possession was reduced to six calendar months. In Virginia estates created or conveyances made to qualify voters were null and void. Persons voting by color of such conveyances or those who, being privy to the purpose of their creation, should aid in drawing them up, were liable to a fine of forty pounds. So far we have only noted the restrictions on what may be termed the county franchise at Virginia general elections. How was it with the residents of towns? The act of 1736 which defined the number of acres to be possessed by freeholders in counties expressly exempted from its operations all freeholders resident in cities or towns incorporated by act of Assembly, and confirmed them in the privilege of voting in right of a house and lot, or of a house and part of a lot. In case the interest in such house and lot was divided, only one vote for it could be admitted. A later statute required such town houses to be at least twelve feet square. The burgess from the College of William and Mary was returned by the President and the masters or professors. The charter of Williamsburg gave the right to return one burgess first to all the freeholders of the city who owned a lot of land in the city with a house built thereon according to law; in the second place, to all actual residents who had a visible estate of fifty pounds current money, and lastly, to all persons who should serve five years at any trade within the city, and should, at the end of that time, be actually housekeepers and residents. Servants, whether white or black, and whether they were bound by indenture, covenant, or other form of obligation, could not vote.

II.

We have taken Virginia as an example of the state of things which obtained in the Southern colonies before the Revolution. Let us turn next to New England. In 1658, just before the interference of the Crown, Connecticut had prescribed a qualification of thirty pounds personal estate, and four years later had changed this to "twenty pounds estate, beside the person in the list of the estate," which apparently means twenty pounds realty, besides the prescribed personal property. There was a doubt, however, about this interpretation, for in 1675 a statute was deemed requisite to provide that, in addition to "these other qualifications expressed in the former law," a freeman must have ten pounds estate in land besides his personal estate. In 1689 a freehold estate worth forty shillings a year was prescribed, and the property qualification was finally fixed at the freehold estate of the value just named, or forty pounds personal estate. When Massachusetts and Plymouth colonies were united, the qualification prescribed for voters was fixed at a freehold estate in land worth forty shillings per annum, or a personal estate valued at forty pounds. In New Hampshire an act of 1691 required voters to have a freehold estate worth forty pounds, or fifty pounds in personal property. After 1729 only freeholders with an estate worth fifty pounds in the town, parish or precinct in which they voted could take part in the election of representatives. Rhode Island in 1665, simply enacted that electors should be men of "competent estates," and the property qualification remained thus indefinite until 1723, when it was decided that a freeman must be a freeholder of lands of the value of one hundred pounds, or forty shillings per annum. Seven years later the requirement was raised to two hundred pounds, or ten pounds a year, and in 1747 it was still further increased to four hundred pounds, or thirty pounds a year. In 1767 there was a democratic reaction, and it was provided that the real estate of an elector need be worth no more than forty pounds nor bring in a larger rental than forty shillings. Rhode Island was the only American colony which permitted a man to vote by virtue of his birth. This franchise was given in 1723 to the eldest son of a freeman, and it seems to have existed for a number of years. As regards the class of estate required, we may mention that in Rhode Island an estate in fee simple, fee tail, or an estate in reversion which qualified no other person, or an estate for one's own life, were sufficient. On the other hand, an admission to vote in right of a wife's dowry, or of an estate in reversion which qualified another person, was null and void.

We come to New York, where property restrictions on the suffrage were retained until near the close of the first quarter of this century. In this province the first charter of liberties declared that all freeholders should have a voice in the election of representatives, and the freeholder was defined to be every one who was so understood according to the laws of England. The second charter explained that a freeholder was a person who had a freehold estate in land worth forty shillings a year. A later act limited the franchise to persons holding land and tenements to the value of forty pounds in freehold, free from all encumbrances. In New York, as in Virginia, an estate for one's own life or for the life of his wife would qualify an elector. We have seen that in this province freeholds must be free from all encumbrances, yet an exception seems to have been recognized in the case of persons who had mortgaged their lands, but were still in possession and in receipt of the income or profits. As to the length of possession required in New York, the period was three months before the issue of a writ of election. Thus far we have spoken only of county franchises. There was a special test for those voters who resided in towns, and this again must be distinguished from the franchise possessed by persons voting for Assemblymen in right of their freedom in municipal corporations, as, for instance, New York and Albany. The Dongan charter gave to the Mayor, Recorder, and Aldermen of New York the privilege of making free citizens under their common seal, and such freemen, as we have said, possessed the privilege of voting for members of the Assembly. The Montgomery charter contained a similar provision. We add that the requirements for municipal freedom under the Dongan charter of Albany were similar to those applied to the city of New York.

III.

In East Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware fifty acres was the amount of land required to qualify a voter. Of these fifty acres, East Jersey required ten to be cultivated; in Pennsylvania, the same number must have been "seated and cleared," though, after 1700, twelve acres must be "cleared and improved;" while Delaware required the whole tract of fifty to be cleared. In Pennsylvania, the voter, instead of having land, might be worth "fifty pounds lawful money of the Government, clear estate;" and in Delaware also a personal estate of forty pounds' value would enfranchise an elector. The laws made by Penn in England offered the privilege of voting to every purchaser of 100 acres of land or upward, his heirs and assigns; to every person paying his passage and taking up 100 acres of land at a penny an acre, and putting ten of them under cultivation; and also to every person who had been a servant or a bondsman, and was free by his service, and had taken up his fifty acres of land and cultivated ten of them. In the Jerseys, after their consolidation under the royal Government, a freeholder having 100 acres of land in his own right, or worth fifty pounds current money of the province in real and personal estate, could vote. This law drew forth a spirited protest from the late proprietors, on the ground that money was an uncertain interest, and, if it were admitted as a qualification equal to land, an Assembly might be packed with strangers and beggars, who would have little regard to the good of the country. That, nevertheless, the objectionable qualification was not repealed, is shown by an act passed in 1767, which reaffirmed the rule which had been followed since the reign of Anne. In New Jersey fraudulent conveyances, made for the purpose of multiplying votes, were taken as absolute against the grantors, though there might be an agreement to reconvey, and collateral securities for defeating the estate were declared void. Passing from county to borough franchises, we find that, by the Fundamental Constitution of East Jersey, the possessor of a house and three acres in a borough was enfranchised. Under the royal Government, two representatives could be returned by the householders of Burlington in West Jersey and by those of Perth Amboy in East Jersey. In Philadelphia, two representatives were returned by those of the inhabitants who had a freehold estate, or who were worth fifty pounds clear personal estate, within the city. In Philadelphia, unlike New York and Albany, the freedom of the city did not of itself entitle a person to vote for Assemblymen.

Let us glance finally at the religious qualifications for the exercise of the franchise. There is a good deal of misconception regarding the amount of toleration which existed even in Maryland and Rhode Island during colonial times. Although Maryland was originally colonized by a Catholic proprietary, it was not long before Roman Catholics were specifically disfranchised by the statutes of the province. If they ever had the right to vote in Maryland they lost it after 1689. Again, in Rhode Island, the first printed edition of the laws, published in 1719, contained the phrase, "All men *professing Christianity*, though of different judgments in religious affairs (*Roman Catholics only excepted*)." It is now, it seems, generally believed that the italicized words were interpolated some time after the law was passed in 16 Charles II; but the clause in regard to Roman Catholics again appeared in the editions and digests published in 1730, 1745, and 1767, and, as the law was not repealed until 1783, there can be no doubt that persons professing this religion could not vote in Rhode Island during the greater part of the eighteenth century. Dr. Bishop has found in two colonies evidence that Jews could not legally vote. His first authority is the decision of the New York Assembly in 1737. He also cites a petition of the South Carolina Assembly, complaining that Jews had been illegally permitted to vote.

Could Quakers vote? They were strictly debarred from exercising the franchise in Massachusetts, and this law was not repealed while the colonial charter remained in force. Although in the other colonies Quakers were not in terms disfranchised, their scruples against taking oaths often debarred them from voting, and special clauses enabling them to affirm instead of taking the prescribed oaths were sometimes inserted in the statutes. In Massachusetts, and also in the New Haven colony, freemen were required to be church members, but the interposition of the Crown ultimately compelled these colonies to abolish this restriction and assimilate their statutes to those of the mother country. Moral as well as religious qualifications were insisted upon in New England, and Virginia very properly denied the franchise to "any convict or person convicted in Great Britain or Ireland during the term for which he is transported," even though such a person might be a freeholder. Qualifications of nationality were rarely prescribed by statute. At first in Pennsylvania, voters were required to be natural born subjects of England; in Delaware, of Great Britain. Later, persons naturalized in England or Pennsylvania could vote either in that colony or in Delaware. Massachusetts, after 1694, required freemen to be Englishmen, and New Hampshire had a similar law for a time, but eventually repealed it. In North Carolina there was a provision that "no inhabitant of this province born out of the allegiance of his Majesty and not made free" could vote. As to the position of the Huguenots in South Carolina, Dr. Bishop has not been able to find either the original or any copy of an act said by Bancroft to have been passed in 1696 by which the suffrage was given to all except Roman Catholics. It is pointed out, however, that, in 1691, six members of the Assembly were returned from Craven county, which was settled almost entirely by Huguenots, and the journal of the Assembly shows that the members from this district took the oath of allegiance to William III. We may note lastly that in Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia negroes, even when free, were disfranchised. In spite of the law, however, free negroes were sometimes permitted to vote in South Carolina. A petition to the Lords Proprietors complains of this abuse being practised in Berkeley county in 1701 and 1703, when "free negroes were received and taken for as good electors as the best freeholders in the province."

Social Life in Germany.

MR. WILLIAM HARBUTT DAWSON, who is known to many American readers by his book on "Prince Bismarck and State Socialism," has collected in two volumes (Appleton's) the impressions and conclusions which he formed during an extended sojourn in Germany. There is scarcely any phase of German national life unnoticed in his comprehensive survey. Yet, while the breadth of the field studied would scarcely prepare us to expect any remarkable depth of insight, the author, who is, of course, an Englishman, has earnestly endeavored to avoid drawing hasty and general deductions from individual peculiarities. He has also tried to shun the fault common among his countrymen of judging Germany by English ideas. He is thoroughly alive to the fact that, in political, social, and religious concerns Germans think and act otherwise than Englishmen, because their history and traditions have been different. He has striven to make allowance for this fact, with the result that his book runs counter to many conceptions current in England. In a word, Mr. Dawson has endeavored to write from the viewpoint of a sincere yet candid well-wisher, of an unprejudiced observer who, even when he is unable to approve, speaks his mind in soberness and kindness. To the author's political researches, which, for the most part, are set forth in the second volume, we may recur at another time; for the moment we intend to indicate some salient and characteristic features of German social life.

I.

The discussion of this branch of the author's subject is appropriately introduced with a chapter on patriotism, one of the words most frequent on the lips of a German, but seldom in our days heard from the mouth of an Englishman. Mr. Dawson would not, indeed, contend that we ought to judge solely by outward demonstrations and infer that the German is at heart more patriotic than the Briton. It is acknowledged, nevertheless, that one cannot witness the assertive character of German patriotism without a feeling of admiration and even of envy. The lavish exterior manifestation of patriotic feeling and loyalty which one now observes in Germany is ascribed to the fact that Germany is still in the early youth of a new national life which owes its existence to patriotic sacrifices so great and yet so willing that their memory not less than their result is a source of continual inspiration. The truth is that the misfortunes which fell upon Germany during the Napoleonic despotism were a blessing in disguise. Germany needed a shock; she needed to be pulled together, to be reminded of what she was, had been, and should be; and the shock, rude as it was, proved her salvation. The time of her humiliation was also the time of her regeneration. The very extremity of her condition called forth soldiers, statesmen, and singers of rare genius; men whose hearts were warmed by the fire of patriotism, who were inspired by the one desire to lift Germany from the dust and place her again upon a throne. It was, indeed, through suffering that her national unity was perfected.

From the close of the last century onward for seventy years the history of Germany is the history of an almost uninterrupted movement toward national reinvigoration. "Ye must be born again" was recognized as the condition of entrance into the condition of liberty, of independence, and of empire. A wonderful succession of epoch-making events made an empire out of a geographical expression and a nation out of a concourse of individuals. No wonder that, with the memory of brilliant national achievements still green, patriotism should flourish to-day in Germany as it never did before. What the elders are because of events they have witnessed or taken part in, the young have become through training. The inculcation of patriotism begins in the elementary school, where it is learned with spelling and geography. The young pupil's very surroundings remind him of his country's history, its military renown, its greatness, and its destiny. As a rule, portraits of the Emperor and Empress look the prospective citizen in the face from morning till night. Hundreds, perhaps thousands, of German schoolrooms are historical portrait galleries on a small and unpretentious scale. Not only the heads of the imperial family, but, outside of Prussia, the rulers of the constituent States, together with the two dead Emperors, and often Bismarck and Moltke, may be seen upon the walls. Nor are the portraits there merely to be looked at; they are used to illustrate the modern history of Germany. Of the higher schools it may be a fault that in the past they have neglected modern history, have, as the present Emperor once complained, travelled by way of Thermopylæ and Cannæ to Sedan and Gravelotte, instead of reversing the process. But, in the elementary schools, the children are, for the most part, well drilled in the knowledge of the leading national events of the last thirty years. They know not only who rules their country, but how he came to rule it; they know that Germany has been unified since 1870, and that their fathers took part in a great campaign against France which proved a series of famous victories. Moreover, whenever Sedan Day recurs, the schools throughout the country are closed, and the children are dismissed for a holiday after a celebration consisting of patriotic songs and recitations, and an address from the teacher by way of reminder of the day's significance. Every schoolboy knows the national colors, and can tell off the regiments as soon as he can master his multiplication table. Patriotism is further instilled in his young mind by the systematic singing of national songs. There is not a child in Germany who does not know his "Heil dir im Siegerkranz," "Deutschland, Deutschland über Alles," "Sie sollen ihn nicht Haben," and "Die Wacht am Rhein." These songs, and others like them, are taught assiduously, and the singing of them forms not the least interesting and important part of school life.

II.

Is the army popular in Germany? According to Mr. Dawson, the assertion often heard outside of Germany that military service is disliked is nonsense. He assures us that, next to the throne, the institution which is most popular in the Fatherland is the army. Its popularity pervades all classes of the population, and so does the popularity of what, in England, is called the Conscription. It is admitted that, if this Conscription meant what the word implies, the enrollment by lot or otherwise of a part only of the able-bodied young men of the nation, military service would, no doubt, be heartily detested. But the fact that the obligation to serve is universal, without distinction of rank or class, makes that an honor which might otherwise have been felt to be a burden. The recruit knows that he only does what every one of his countrymen, if physically fit to serve, either has done, is doing, or will do, and the knowledge reconciles him to every sacrifice imposed upon him. Mr. Dawson, indeed, would not deny that there are a good many exceptions to the rule, and that a small minority regard military service as onerous; the roll of those who abandon their country rather than perform a soldier's duty would falsify such a denial. It is also conceded that not a few who may not seek to escape from their obligation to the nation discharge it grudgingly. This, however, is asserted without fear of contradiction that, while military service entails much hardship and interference with plans and prospects, the number of the one-year or even three-year recruits who carry into life any grudge against the army, or who regard their association with it other than with feelings of gratification, is comparatively small. Even workingmen, upon whom military duties might seem to press most heavily, are, we are assured, as warmly attached to the army as are the sons of officers themselves.

We are further told by the author of this work that the general treatment of the rank and file by German officers is considerate and kindly. The exercises may at times be severe, and the manœuvres are always intensely fatiguing, yet the attitude of the commissioned officer toward his men is everything that could be desired, and in return the loyalty of the common soldier to his superior is complete, and his obedience, patience, and self-denial worthy of the best military traditions. Mr. Dawson, however, does not overlook the charge of abuse of power which is occasionally brought home to the non-commissioned officers. It is admitted that many of these men inflict upon the privates hardship and even cruelty such as would, if their conduct came to light, entail upon them severe punishment and dismissal from the army. There is no doubt that arbitrary penalties are imposed by irascible under-officers, who are often men without refinement or even humane instincts, and who, finding themselves clothed in a little brief authority, magnify and abuse their powers. Yet it is not to be supposed that abuse of this kind is the rule, or that, when discovered, it is not sternly rebuked.

III.

Our attention is directed to a contradiction hard for Americans to understand, that, though the German army is in a literal sense a citizen army, there exists, nevertheless, in this military democracy an aristocracy of a most exclusive kind. A deep social gulf, at the bottom of which are pride and prejudice unfathomable, divides the officers from the civil population. The officers form, in fact, a social caste of a peculiarly rigid kind. In their eyes the manufacturer, the banker, the tradesman, and everybody else connected with commerce and money making are vulgar. No distinction is recognized, but all are treated with the same contumely and hateur. In small garrison towns military exclusiveness is carried to the extreme degree. There officers' families constitute socially an imperium in imperio. Civilians cannot reach them, and they keep aloof from civilians. To all intents and purposes the two sections of the population are unknown to each other. This dislike of the military for the civilian element may seem unreasonable, but it is a noteworthy and interesting circumstance in these days when, in other countries, uneducated money-bags and commercial upstarts make pretences immeasurably beyond their deserts. It is at least a sign that in Germany money does not yet carry everything before it. There birth and culture still meet with a recognition that is grudgingly given in those countries which are dominated by the trading spirit and the worship of gold. Officers can count on being welcomed in the highest circles all over Germany. Officers of the Guard, indeed, are ipso facto hoffähig, or presentable at court. At the same time, while despising the money maker, the officer does not exhibit the same aversion to the dowry of the moneymaker's daughter. Here is the civilian's chance. Proportionate to the exclusiveness of the military élite is the ambition of the ostracized civilian to force his way into the charmed circle. In the eyes of German mothers and daughters, officers are sought after as pearls of great price. The daughter of a landed proprietor, or even of a very well-to-do manufacturer, or a reputable banker, may, under ordinary circumstances, count with a close approach to certainty on a military marriage, and this is the best that her parents desire for her, or that she desires for herself. The truth is that the officer generally needs all the money he can command. His profession is an expensive one, encouraging, if not absolutely requiring, an outlay far exceeding the small pay which belongs to all but the higher grades of officers. Marriage is, therefore, out of the question for the subaltern, unless he can secure a wife well endowed with this world's goods.

Strange to say, the constant assertion of superiority on the part of German officers has not awakened widespread or resolute retaliation. He assumes a distinctive dignity, and the rest of the world concedes the pretension without challenge. In spite of his disdain for civilian society, the officer is regarded by the majority of impressionable people as a being not made of common clay. In the eyes of the female world, as we have said, he is a hero or a demigod. The bourgeois also looks upon him with secret admiration, for, though he may sometimes sneer at him, it is rather the flattering sneer of envy than that of malice. When, too, an officer is on parade, the workingman will discourse as enthusiastically as the rest upon his carriage, his movements, and even his uniform, though, in his private meditations, the laborer is apt to count the cost of the braid and buttons. In public places the officer throws the civilian altogether into the shade. When his epaulets loom into sight all the rest of the scene fades for the average spectator into obscurity. The shopman will even leave his civilian customer in order that a Colonel, a Captain, or a Lieutenant may not be kept waiting. It is acknowledged that the junior officers are not all models of modesty; on the contrary, a young Lieutenant is apt to think that streets, foot ways, public parks, and pretty girls exist for his exclusive benefit; it is not until he becomes a Captain that his self-assertiveness is toned down. Meanwhile, numberless quarrels and duels occur between subalterns and that other section of irresponsible youth which is conspicuous for self-sufficiency, the students at the universities. Where the son of Mars and the son of the Muses are not fast friends, they are bitter foes; there is no such medium as negative indifference.

Whatever may be the attitude of officers toward the rest of society, and although in all the favorite regiments noblemen are in a large majority, there exist among themselves reciprocal faithfulness and a perfect esprit de corps. Touching this point, the author tells an anecdote which, although we have heard it before, is worth reproducing for its significance. It appears that into the officers' corps of a distinguished Prussian regiment the son of a rich banker, who had just received the noble prefix von, had managed to squeeze himself. There was only one other officer in the regiment who did not belong to the nobility, yet he was none the less respected or popular for that—a fact which the newcomer either did not know or did not understand. On one occasion the banker invited all of his son's fellow officers, with the one plebeian exception, to a sumptuous dinner. The hour came, and the officers were assembled at table. Then only did they miss the absentee. Looks of surprise were exchanged, and, interpreting these, the host essayed to appease his guests' curiosity by remarking, with the blandest of smiles, "Oh, you see, we are going to be *entre nous* to-day." "Then we must not disturb you," said his right-hand neighbor, who forthwith rose from his seat and retired from the room, followed in the most perfect military order by the whole table of guests. The banker and his family were left to entertain each other. We should add that in Germany, wherever an officer goes, he almost always wears the uniform which stamps him as the King's soldier. He may, perchance, depart from the rule when he takes a holiday trip, in order to enjoy the quiet and seclusion which civil dress alone can procure for him; at home the uniform is never laid aside. In a drawing room, at a ball, at the play, a concert, at public gatherings of all kinds, he appears as a soldier, and, by virtue of his very uniform, he is honored. Moreover, German soldiers receive no pay; service in the German army is a paid service only for those who follow it professionally; that is to say, for officers commissioned and non-commissioned.

IV.

In a chapter on manners and titles Mr. Dawson points out that the forms of courtesy are in general admirably observed in Germany among and between all classes. Often, no doubt, one may feel that the forms are purely conventional; yet it is submitted that, after all, attention to the slightest amenities of personal intercourse is agreeable, and even superficial courtesy is more acceptable than the brusqueness of the boor, who prides himself upon the fact that he owes no man anything, neither money nor, much less, civility. In Germany even the attitude of the so-called lower classes toward their social superiors is marked, as a rule, by a quiet respect and deference. Unquestionably, the military system, with its rigorous discipline and its encouragement of self-restraint, has largely helped to make the popular demeanor so decorous. We are assured, however, that good manners are learned before entrance into the army. Politeness, like patriotism, is taught in the elementary schools, and military service does but confirm the training of the classroom.

Essaying to determine how far the courtesy and etiquette which are usually observed with so much care are put on, the author notes that the Germans themselves appreciate the difference between the kindly disposition and the grace of manner which are acquired and those which are innate. The one they call courtesy pure and simple; the other courtesy of heart. The superficial side of the practice of courtesy is most conspicuous in the epistolary forms of address, which have grown out of a studied observance of conventionality in written communications. What, asks Mr. Dawson, shall one say of the verbal superfluities with which German letters abound, the prefixes, the signatures, the protestations of obedience and humility, the accumulated assurances of honor and respect, the compliments that mean everything or nothing. It is, it seems, at once a science and an art, this distribution of the right phrases in the right places. We are told that the Jewish shopkeeper has an unfailing instinct for the correct apportionment of such formalities, and he revels in them. If you are nobody, he will address you with a simple "Sir," or at most with a stiff "Honored Sir," and finally says "Yours," or "Respectfully." If you are something above a social negation, you will be addressed as "Very Honored Sir," or "Well Born," and, should your calling be associated with literature, you may rely on receiving the title of "Doctor," from "Your Highly Respectful" or "Most Humble" correspondent. But this is only the beginning of a gradation of reverential addresses, which, when it culminates, would be sublime were it not ridiculous. "Well born" advances to "Highly well-born," and this to "High-born" in the event of aristocratic birth. A Protestant clergyman is addressed as "Your Reverence," and a Catholic priest as "Highly Reverenced." Where high officials have to be approached deference becomes doubly and trebly servile. Yet here, too, there is a proper code of formality which may not be departed from on pain of giving dire offence and incurring the odium of bad breeding. "Full of reverence," "Dutifully," and "Full of awe" are rising grades. When the higher nobility is addressed language fails to express the awe which is deemed requisite. A ruling count is "Illustrious," a prince "Most serene," and a prince of the blood is, as elsewhere, "Royal Highness." The occupants of a throne are spoken of in elaborate terms suggestive of Oriental effusiveness. The plural form is used when either king or queen is named. His or her Majesty *have* said or done this or that; *are* coming here or going there; and so in all cases. When the King makes an appointment, he is not simply "pleased" to do so, but "in accordance with his most high resolution, he most graciously designs," &c. Even death does not make all men equal, for then, too, obsequious expressions are reserved for royal personages. The dead body is spoken of as "the high corpse," or the "most high corpse," and the departed is not merely "blessed," but "highly blessed," or "most blessed." Not only is an extravagant system of address in vogue throughout all ranks, but most people insist upon receiving the deference which they consider due to them. In Berlin, not long ago, a lady accused a tradesman of an intended insult, in that he had only signed himself in a letter "most humbly," and not "respectfully and most humbly." The Court of the first instance took the complainant's view, though, on appeal, its verdict was reversed. The business man has his revenge occasionally. About the same time a Berlin shopkeeper obtained the conviction and punishment of a lady who had sent him a post card containing the offensive question, "Are you too busy to answer the question I asked?"

V.

It is also well known that all over Germany excessive importance is attached to titles. In every State these are bestowed in great number and variety, with the result of minimizing or destroying the significance of all but the most select of them. In some of the smaller States the title question has been reduced to a farce, so that in the eyes of intelligent men it has become a greater dignity to be without a prefix than to have one. Absurd as is the superfluity of titles, matters are made worse by the custom of prefixing to a name the official and even professional and business rank of its bearer. To address orally a person who belongs to the official or the professional class without indicating his rank would be offensive. Thus you speak to Mr. Counsellor of Commerce, or, if your acquaintance be a clergyman, to Mr. Pastor. Neither are the wives forgotten in the observance of titular distinction. They must be addressed as Mrs. Counsellor of Commerce or as Mrs. Pastor. Occasionally actions at law are instituted because of the withholding of a title rightly acquired. In the society of small towns this formality is observed to the point of childishness. More offence is given, more friendships are destroyed, more malice is generated, more women are sent home in chagrin from scenes of social intercourse through disregard of this trivial point than by all other causes put together. A Munich newspaper recently recorded the death of a woman who was described as the wife of a "Royal Court Theatre Color Grinder's Assistant." That is superlative common sense compared with the titles which used to be self-assumed in Bavaria not many years ago. "Royal Supernumerary Haybinder's daughter," and "Head Bill Poster's daughter," were the descriptions given in newspapers of maidens who had been betrothed. Indeed, it was formerly a custom for Bavarian business people to address all officials as nobles ipso facto. The most ordinary Herr Schmidt or Schulze became von by the grace of his grocer or tailor, until the Government eventually commanded its servants to disown all sham dignities. Nevertheless, although titles are so common, the law is very stringent regarding their misuse. According to the Prussian penal code, a person who unlawfully uses a title, a uniform, an official dress or badge, an order, or a dignity is liable to be imprisoned or fined up to $37.50. So freely is the term title interpreted that any one pretending to occupy an office in the State service—be it so humble as that of a law court clerk—comes within the purview of this prohibition. It must also be admitted that the German law on this subject would abolish some titular absurdities met with in England and the United States. In Germany, when a man takes the prefix Dr., you may be certain that he has won it by hard work in a national university, and that his doctorate does not emanate from an unknown seminary in Timbuctoo. So it is with professors; they are so by rank and right, conferred duly by the State, because deserved. The term professor always stands in Germany for a teacher of the highest order. If a man is a professor of music, you may safely conclude that he is an instructor in a State academy, and not the leader of a street band. It may be added that as yet in Germany there are no "professors" of legerdemain or ventriloquism, neither is the term applied to chiropodists. An artist also is either a sculptor, a painter, or a musician; never a negro minstrel nor a music-hall dancer. A philanthropic German gentleman once narrated with mixed merriment and surprise how a distressed American had come to his door for alms, representing that he was an "artist." The German's heart yearned for the ill-starred genius, until, further details being furnished, the artist turned out to be a roller skater.

VI.

As regards the social position of women, we are assured that the husband in a well-to-do household can no longer be represented as a slavedriver. Nevertheless there does unquestionably exist a considerable class of men which holds fast to the old theory of woman's natural inferiority, and views with great jealousy and dislike all tendencies toward conceding greater liberties to the inferior sex. These antiquated and narrow ideas may even be met with occasionally in places where wisdom and toleration might be looked for. The truth is that, although there has been a marked improvement since the beginning of the century, the great majority of men and the great majority of women also are not conscious that the present relationship calls for serious change. The average man would be surprised, if not indignant, to be told that the position of his sisters and of his wife is not now in every respect what Providence intended it to be. The average woman would, in Germany, take the same view, so far is she from sharing the ideals of those of her sex, who, in scorn, are called the emancipated. The common opinion is that the home is the only sphere in which woman's activity should be exercised, and that, out of the home, she is out of her true province. In the words of an often-quoted proverb, the house is woman's world; the world is man's house.

As for the type of the domesticated husband, nowhere will he be found more exemplary or more amiable than in the German middle class. Husband and wife are generally inseparable. They will be found together at home, at the play, at the concert, in the park, at the forest, even in the café, though the wife has usually to go alone to church. The paterfamilias in this rank of life would not, in fact, enjoy himself unless in the company of his wife, or, better still, of his wife and children. Mr. Dawson tells us that the wife, for her part, well deserves the trust and attachment of her partner. She lives for him, and has no higher aspiration than to earn his approval by faithful attention to wifely and motherly duties. The German wife in general, whatever her rank, is emphatically a hard worker. It is no nominal sway that she exercises over the domestic realm. She is sovereign and executive combined. She both issues and enforces the household decrees. Let her domestic servants be ever so numerous, she is herself never above using her hands. We are cautioned, nevertheless, against concluding because of their domesticity that German women and girls are badly educated. The contrary seems to be the case. In the higher girls' schools an admirable education is imparted, and the intellectual status of the women who have passed through them is high. It is said that these schools unquestionably surpass all but the best of the similar institutions in England.

The position of the woman question in Germany is summed up in a few words. There is, as we have said, no opposition at all to the liberal education of women. It is true that neither academic nor public opinion is, as yet, prepared to sanction the admission of women to the universities, though many influential petitions in favor of this step have been presented to the Reichstag and to some of the Diets. Nevertheless, while the general principle of exclusion from the highest seats of learning is maintained, several exceptions have been made in the cases both of Germans and of foreigners. So far as the political prospects of women are concerned, Mr. Dawson can see no reason to expect substantial changes for many years to come. If a proposal like woman's suffrage is still theoretical in England, what must it be in Germany, where even direct manhood suffrage is only tolerated for one legislative body, the Reichstag, and even its application to that is lamented by a large section of the community. Yet, if women are not allowed to vote, many of them can and do advocate and agitate the extension both of the franchise and of other civil rights to their sex. It is pointed out as particularly noteworthy how many women of the working class are nowadays found assembling in public meetings to promote political, social, and moral reforms; to social democracy is ascribed the credit of having awakened the wives, sisters, and daughters of workingmen to the consciousness of their interest in the laws, institutions, and customs of their country.

It must, at the same time, be acknowledged that in parts of Germany women are accustomed to follow some employments suited neither to their sex nor to their strength. It is a common thing to see women drawing small wagons along the streets of towns or country roads. Sometimes they only assist the dogs, which form the real team, but frequently they bear the whole burden alone. More regrettable still is the employment of women in agricultural work. The traveller who goes eastward from the coast of Holland along the shores of the North Sea will all along the route find women in the fields busy at operations which should fall to men. They may often be seen ploughing, harrowing, potato digging, hand thrashing, and carrying heavy baskets of manure, while men may be engaged in activities of an easier kind. In Silesia women take an even more active part in the labors of the fields. It is creditable to the Catholic and Socialist parties in the Reichstag that for years they have pleaded for the greater restriction of female work in the factories preparatory to its entire suppression. Up to this point law and public opinion are likely soon to go hand in hand. M. W. H.

EUROPEAN SOVEREIGNS.

Many Past Seventy Yet Still Ruling with the Power of Youth.

The Almanach de Gotha for 1894 has buried in its numerous finely printed pages some interesting facts as to the ages of European sovereigns. The oldest of all is the Pope, who is in his 84th year. Next comes the Grand Duke of little Luxemburg, who is 76. The King of Denmark and the Grand Duke of Saxe-Weimar are 75; Queen Victoria and the Grand Duke of Mecklenburg-Strelitz, 74. There are six other sovereigns who are older than 70; eleven who are between 60 and 70, and five who are between 50 and 60. Eleven are between 40 and 50, two between 30 and 40, and two more between 20 and 30. The youngest three sovereigns are King Alexander of Servia, 17; Queen Wilhelmina of the Netherlands, 13, and King Alfonso XIII. of Spain, 7[illegible].

Queen Victoria has had the longest reign—56 years. Emperor Franz Josef has reigned 45 years; the Grand Duke of Baden, 41 years; the Grand Dukes of Oldenburg, of Saxe-Weimar-Eisenach, and of Saxe-Altenburg, 40 years each. Fourteen of the sovereigns of Europe have reigned fewer than ten years. During 1893 three new sovereigns ascended the throne. They are Prince George of Schaumburg-Lippe, Prince Frederick of Waldeck, and Duke Alfred of Coburg, better known as the Duke of Edinburgh.

Forgot His Temporary Name.

From the Chicago Daily Inter-Ocean.

It is not an unusual thing for a man sojourning in a big city to come home to his hostelry so fatigued that he is not sure about his own name, but a guest in the Palmer House found himself in a stranger predicament than that.

A well-dressed gentleman with a close-cropped beard walked up to the cashier and asked for his bill. He wanted to make a train in fifteen minutes.

"What is the name?" asked the cashier.

A startled look came on the guest's face, and, mumbling some excuse for not answering the clerk's question, he turned away and paced up and down for a minute or two.

Then he rushed to the register and scanned its pages eagerly, but without any apparent relief. The hotel people began to regard him with suspicion, but Mr. Townsend finally approached him kindly and asked what was the matter. Then the guest confessed. He said he had come to the hotel the day before and had registered under an assumed name.

"There are some people," said he, "whom I did not want to know I was here, but I have forgotten the name I put on your register."

The books were overhauled, and the name was found in time to enable the man to reach his train. The name he had used was M. M. Short, but he told nobody his real cognomen.

OLD THEATRICAL DAYS.

How a Ticket Speculator Wins a Wager by the Aid of a Violin Case.

"The palmy days of the ticket speculator are over," said the old theatrical man. "There's nothing in the business nowadays. Newspaper criticisms, the result of [illegible] sentiment, were the first things to kill the business, and it never has and never will revive. Why, it was nothing in the old times for a man to make $25 and [illegible] in a night speculating. It wasn't necessary either for a man to stand in [illegible] the box office in order to make money as speculators have to nowadays. A speculator could be stuck with fifteen or twenty tickets and still make some profit. So far as making money now, though, there's little in it. A speculator is in luck if he can knock out $[illegible] a night. All of the old-timers who made big money speculating years ago are either dead or in other branches of the business now. A trickier or smarter crowd of fellows than some of the old-time speculators could not be found.

"About the most successful game I ever saw worked by a speculator was the scheme gotten up by Jimmy Hyde, then prominent among ticket speculators, to beat the French ball. Jimmy, who is now with the Casino, made up his mind that it would be an easy thing to beat the ball out of several hundred dollars. Max Hirsch, who was then and is now the treasurer of the Metropolitan Opera House, was telling Hyde about the elaborate arrangements that were being made for the French ball that year, and how it was bound to be a great success on account of the entire suspension of the free list, when Hyde exclaimed: 'Suspend the free list, eh! Well, you can suspend' and be damned, but, just the same, I'm going to pass in at least fifteen people.' 'I'll bet you don't pass in a soul, barring yourself,' replied Hirsch. The result was a heavy wager, Hyde betting that he would pass in at least ten strangers for nothing, giving none of them tickets or passes. Every one who heard of the bet laughed at Hyde, but Jimmy simply smiled and said nothing. Those who knew Jimmy Hyde felt confident that he would succeed in doing what he had boasted he could do, although nobody could see just how he was going to manage it. Well, on the night of the ball Hirsch stuck around the door of the Opera House all night, watching every one that passed in. It was just about midnight when Hyde, followed by a meek-looking individual, who carried something under his coat, showed up in the vicinity. Leaving his companion on the corner Jimmy walked into the lobby and approached a young man who was leaning against the wall.

"'Going in?' asked Hyde.

"'Can't; ain't got the price,' responded the stranger.

"'How much have you got?' asked Hyde.

"'Two an' a half.'

"'Well, it's money any way, so come on' and Hyde walked out of the lobby, followed by the young man.

"'Now, see here,' said Jimmy when they reached the corner, 'when you get inside don't stop a second, but just go right past the wine room, down toward the stage. At the left end you'll find a flight of stairs, go down them and you'll find yourself in the cellar right under one of the gratings which opens on Thirty-ninth street. Will you do that?'

"'I don't see any use of doing all that, but you get me in, and I'll do it.'

"'All right,' said Hyde, and he took the bundle from under his companion's coat and handed it to the young man. It was an old and battered violin case.

"'Take that and walk right through the door,' said Hyde. 'If any one says anything to you, just say "musician," and pass on. When you get in the cellar, pass it up to me.'

"The young man took the case and walked into the lobby and past the doormen without any trouble. In three minutes he was under the grating and had passed the case up through a small aperture. Nine other men, each of whom paid from $2 to $4 apiece for the use of the violin case, were successfully passed through. Hirsch stood at the door the whole time and never once saw through the game. It was one of the doormen who caught on first. He thought it remarkable that so many of the orchestra were coming in late, and when Hyde's eleventh man tried to pass through, he nailed him. 'Musician,' said the man hoarsely, but it was no go. The doorman took the case away and opened it. Of course, it was empty. Hyde saw that the game was up, and almost burst with laughter when he saw his man go sailing out into the street, with the old violin case flying after him. The truth flashed on Hirsch in an instant. Two mutual friends, whom Hyde had let into the secret at the last moment, testified that ten men had been passed through on the old case, and Hirsch paid over the amount of the wager like a man. It didn't take the crowd long to drink up the money, and when it was gone Hyde was forced to blow in the money he had collected from those he had passed in, too. That was a mighty neat piece of work, that was, and there wasn't another man in New York but Jimmy Hyde who would have thought of it. It seems that Hyde had made up his mind to beat the ball in that way long before the bet was made, and that he only accepted the wager because he saw a chance to rake in a few dollars more.

"Yes, the day of the ticket speculator is over, and despite the old saying that history repeats itself, I don't believe it'll ever come around again."

HIS CUSTOMERS MOVED UP TOWN.

Leaving the Old Caterer, Overfashionable Among the Tenements.

Just above Canal street, under the shadow of the Sixth avenue elevated tracks, a little flight of steps leads up to an old-fashioned doorway. A sign at one side announces that silver will be loaned at moderate prices, and in the bay window overhanging the walk there is a prodigious epergne flanked with pitchers, sugar bowls, and candelabra, to give an idea of the resources of the would-be lender. Inside the hall are two doors, and by one of them is a piece of pasteboard with the inscription:

"Ring if you want to see the caterer."

The bell is not visible, but a dangling wire, with an iron weight is, and if you tug at the weight your own ears will assure you that you have followed the injunction on the cards.

The proprietor will be very apt to startle you by opening the door behind you and popping out suddenly in the semi-darkness. If you ask to see the silver he will take down a stupendous key from a nail inside the door he has just opened, and, unlocking the opposite one, will usher you into an apartment whose sole window is the one graced by that dignified old epergne. It is narrow at best, and is made even more so by cases along the walls. Here behind glass doors are rows of quaint little swollen pitchers, pudgy bowls, and silver soup tureens gorgeously embellished with the figures of a past generation. They have such "an air" about them that you think they are solid. But they are not. They are plated, not only with silver, but as you presently find with associations also.

The proprietor is tall and dark. After your eyes grow accustomed to the half light you realize that he is a mulatto, though he hasn't the Southern accent. He is the caterer, and for forty years he has occupied that same room, and for almost fifty years that very location. In 1852 he moved into the building he now occupies. When the house was moved back at the time of the widening of the street to make room for the elevated road he moved out, but as soon as the edifice was settled into place he took up his old quarters again. In his day he has served the fashionable people of New York, but he has found his custom changing with the growth of the city, until now his best patrons, perhaps, are to be found in the tenements of Thompson street.

"Do you remember when the Schermerhorns lived down on Great Jones street? I take it the answer to that question depends somewhat on the one who reads it, but very few will be able to answer yes. But the caterer of South Fifth avenue does. Why, he served for old Mr. and Mrs. Schermerhorn's diamond wedding. That was indeed a great event. The caterer's face grows melancholy as he recalls its glories, and tells how the old gentleman and lady got on the floor and danced when the band began to play.

"They don't dance that way now-a-days," he said, reflectively, the other day. "No, indeed! They were more dignified and stately then. Things didn't go with a hop, skip, and a jump, and the old couple kept up with the [illegible] even if they were almost a hundred years old.

"No," he went on sadly, "my old [illegible] customers have all gone away from here. There was Mrs. [illegible] Morgan. I used to serve for all her big parties. And there were the Tracks and the Livingstons and [illegible] connections. They used to live in the [illegible] round here, Great Jones, and Bond and [illegible] dam. But they've all moved up town. Why, I remember when the places they live now were just a wilderness.

"Before the elevated was built I had a good many customers from up town. [illegible] the custom for ladies to drive down with their husbands every morning as far as [illegible] street. They didn't go any further, because there were so many trucks and carts, [illegible] husbands would take the street cars at the corner just below here. Then, in the afternoon, the ladies would drive down again to meet the gentlemen and take them [illegible] and, of course, if they were a little [illegible] the carriages would draw up and [illegible] a look while they waited. The ladies [illegible] see my place, and I got a good many [illegible] that way. But times have changed." [illegible] looked out of the smoky window at a [illegible] as it thundered by, and sadly fingered the [illegible] epergne, the relic of bygone grandeur.